



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,695	08/02/2002	Niels Rump	13189.136	3855

22862 7590 10/12/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP  
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L  
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
----------

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/913,695

Applicant(s)

RUMP ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew T. Henning

Art Unit

2131

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 9/29/2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: None.
- Claim(s) objected to: None.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.


Continuation of 3. NOTE: A "header" is much narrower in scope than a "start block", and as such would require further consideration if entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding applicants' assertion that a "start block" and a "header" are the same, the examiner disagrees. This is because a "start block" can be any block of data in which anything "starts", including the first block which is acted on in a certain way. A header, on the other hand, is much more specific. A header is supplemental data placed at the beginning of a block of data being stored or transmitted, which contain information for the handling of the data block. As such, the examiner feels that the amendments after final rejection do change the scope of the claim and as such have not been entered. Furthermore, all arguments that relied upon a "header" have not been further addressed as a header is not present in the claims.

Regarding applicants' argument that Saito did not disclose a "start section" that remains unencrypted, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive for the reasons previously given in the office action dated 7/27/2006. Furthermore, the only requirements of the start section are that it remains unencrypted, as does the leftmost unencrypted data block of Fig. 4G of Saito, and that an encrypted section of data is appended to the start section, as is the case in Saito as clearly seen in Fig. 4G. Therefore, the examiner does not find the arguments persuasive.

Regarding applicants' argument that claims 6 and 13 do recite that "the header includes a part requiring information for playing the first unencrypted start section of the user data block and second information required for decrypting the following encrypted data block", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. There is no recitation of a header in either of claims 6 or 13, and as such the examiner has not addressed the argument.

Regarding applicants' argument that there is support in the specification for the limitation of a unit for processing only the information of the start block which is needed to play back the start section of the user data block", the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Although the specification does provide support for a unit which initially processes only the information necessary for playing back the unencrypted section, there is no support for the unit processing only that information and never any other information. As such, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive..

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100